

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 remain pending in the present application, with all claims being rejected. The Examiner rejected the claims as follows. Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,948,066 (Whalen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,564,060 B1 (Hoagland). Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Whalen in view of Haogland and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,015 B1 (Phillips).

Whalen describes delivery of information over narrow-band communications links.

Hoagland discloses a method of supervising on the forward link in a high data rate system, wherein a base station transmits to an access terminal on a forward traffic channel only when the base station has data to send to the access terminal.

Phillips discloses a system of communication devices, methods and computer programs for establishing concurrent calls on a single TDMA frequency.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), the

Examiner states that the combination of Whalen and Hoagland discloses each and every element of Claim 1. The Examiner points to FIG. 2 and Column 10, Lines 18-25 of Hoagland as teaching step (d) of Claim 1. However, the cited figure and passage only teach that if the access terminal remains in the Transmitter Off State 232 for a specified period of time (e.g., a supervision time or 4.8 seconds), the access terminal transitions into the Release State 206. In other words, Hoagland discloses releasing an access terminal when the access terminal is in the Transmitter Off State 232 for a predetermined time by checking whether a Turn-Off Timer is activated.

In contrast, amended Claim 1 includes the recitation of temporarily releasing access to the webserver, upon failure to receive any web related operation command from the user within a predetermined time after displaying the web document, which is neither taught nor suggested by Whalen or Hoagland or the combination thereof. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C §103(a) of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), Claim 8 has been amended to include the recitation of determining if at least one user command requesting performance of any of a plurality of web related operations were input within a predetermined time after a predetermined action, which is neither taught nor suggested by

Whalen, Hoagland or Phillips or the combination thereof. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C §103(a) of Claim 8 be withdrawn.

In light of the discussion above, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 8 overcome the stated rejections and are in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-7 and 9 it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependence on Claims 1 and 8, respectively.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact

Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG/ml